

REMARKS

The Official Action mailed April 8, 2004, has been carefully reviewed. The claims in the application are now claims 1-22 and 25, of which claims 1-12 have been allowed. No prior art has been applied. Applicants respectfully request favorable consideration and early formal allowance.

Claims 1-12 have been allowed. Applicants accordingly understand that these claims are deemed by the PTO to not only define novel and unobvious subject matter under §§102 and 103, but also to be in full conformance with all other patentability requirements.

Claims 13-25 have been rejected under both §101 and the second paragraph of §112 as being, respectively, (1) non-statutory as being neither a process nor a machine, and (2) indefinite in not particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the invention. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Nevertheless in deference to the examiner's views and to avoid needless argumentation, claim 13 has been amended to make more clear that it and the claims which depend therefrom are process claims. The amendments so made are deemed by applicants to be cosmetic and non-narrowing. The scope of claim 13 and the claims which depend therefrom

remains the same; the scope of the claims has not been reduced. No limitations have been added and none are intended.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections based on §§101 and 112, second paragraph.

Applicants respectfully note that claims 13-25 have not been rejected on the basis of any prior art, whereby applicants understand that these claims (even in their previous form) were deemed by the PTO to define novel and unobvious subject matter under §§102 and 103.

The dependent portion of claim 22 has been amended above to correct a typographical or clerical error.

Claim 25 has been re-structured as a Beauregard type claim. Claim 25 meets all statutory requirements including those of §101 and 112. Applicants comments above with respect to claim 13 and the claims which depend therefrom are respectfully repeated by reference with respect to claim 25.

The prior art document made of record and not relied upon has been noted, along with the implication that such document is deemed by the PTO to be insufficiently pertinent to warrant its application against any of applicants' claims.

Appln. No. 09/431,067
Amd. dated July 8, 2004
Reply to Office Action of April 8, 2004

Applicants believe that all issues have been
addressed above and have been resolved, whereby formal
allowance is now in order. Such is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicants

By

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "S. Neimark", written over a horizontal line.

Sheridan Neimark
Registration No. 20,520

SN:jaa
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\C\cohn\herzberg1\pto\AMD 8JL04.doc